



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,612	03/05/2002	Per A. Tagseth	03292.101190.	8241
66569 7590 12/31/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
AHMED, AFFAF				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/31/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/091,612

**Applicant(s)**

TAGSETH ET AL.

**Examiner**

AFAF AHMED

**Art Unit**

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-36 and 38-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8 and 37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-36 and 38-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 49 and 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. This action is in reply to the amendment filed on 10/20/2008.
2. Claims 1, 20,38,42,44, and 48-50 have been amended.
3. Claims 6-8, 37 are cancelled.
4. Claims 1-5, 9-36, 38-50 are currently pending and have been examined.
5. Applicants fails to correct claim objection for informalities for claims 49 and 50, therefore the objection is maintained.
6. Applicant has clarified claim rejections -35 USC § 112 second paragraph for claims 1, 20 and 38. Therefore the rejection is withdrawn.
7. Applicant has amended claims 42, 44, 48 and 50 to overcome claim rejections -35 USC § 112 insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations. Therefore the rejection is withdrawn.
8. Applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice, therefore the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

### ***Response to Applicant's Arguments***

9. Applicant's amendment and arguments filed on 10/20/2008 have been fully considered and discussed in the next section. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretations.
10. With regard to claims 1 and 38, Applicant argues that McElfresh does not modify elements within advertisements in anyway after selection. The claim recites does not recite modify elements within the advertisements after selection. the claim recites the limitation of wherein the presentation engine is configured to receive one element of at least one retrieved offer based on an offeree's trait and a context in which the one or more retrieved offers to be presented. It has been held that although claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims (In re Van Geuns, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (CA FC 1993)). McElfresh in at least column 6, lines 35-56 and FIG 3 (a) and 3(b) discloses when a site wants to show a page, it contacts a relational server component (the RAD SERVER). The site contacts the RAD SERVER and indicates which webpage and website to be shown. The RAD SERVER performs the overall functions of gathering the necessary information regarding a particular ad or set of ads and the particular user and generating a set of ads which have been optimized

for placement on webpage. The ads are prioritized based the user traits and the context in which the ad to be presented (paragraph 13). Therefore, McElfresh does not have any deficiency.

### ***Claim Objections***

11. Claims 49 and 50 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 49 and 50 are referring to a method claim, instead of referring to a system claims as recited in claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claims 42, 44, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 42, 44, 48 and 50 recites the limitation of: *wherein the context includes the availability of the product*. The specification teaches "The database 110 includes data for online offers 160, such as its descriptive attributes 164 as well as the rules as to how the offer is to be managed and used. This representation is generic, because in one embodiment, there is nothing stored as to how the offer 160 will be used by the different application/business unit. This separation of content (the offer) 160 and context (how it will be used by some application) allows the offers 160 to be simplified and enables the platform to be integrated and standardized (paragraph 31)." The specification does not teach *wherein the context includes the availability of the product*.

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. Claims 42,44,48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

16. Claims 42, 44, 48 and 50 recites the limitation of: *wherein the context includes the availability of the product*. It is unclear what Applicant is referring to by *wherein the context includes the availability of*

*the product?* How the context, which Applicant has defined as the offer, will be used by some application, will include the availability of the product? Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 1-4, 9-36 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElfresh et al, US Pat 6,907,566 B1.

#### **Claims 1 and 38:**

McElfresh discloses:

- *a centralized repository configured to store a plurality of incentive offers* (see at least column 6, lines 57-65);
- *a retrieval engine communicatively coupled to the centralized repository for retrieving one or more incentive offers from the plurality of incentive offers* (see at least column 7, lines 5-14 and fig 3 A with the associated text);
- *a presentation engine communicatively coupled to retrieval engine for presenting the one or more incentive offers, to an offeree* (see at least column 6, lines 36-40 and fig 3A with the associated text);

With regard to the limitation of:

- *wherein the retrieval engine is configured to retrieve the one or more offers based at least in part on a set of rules defining particular contexts required to present the plurality of incentives offers stored in the central repository to specific offerees and wherein the presentation engine is configured to receive the one or more retrieved offers from the retrieval engine and then modify at least one element of at least one retrieved offer based on an offeree's trait and a context in which the one or more retrieved offers are to be presented.*

McElfresh in at least column 6, lines 15-56 and fig 3A with the associated text discloses a website contacting the RAD server and requesting advertisements (offer). The RAD server performs overall functions of gathering the necessary information regarding particular ads, as well as gathering the necessary information regarding a particular user and generates a set of ads customized for the user. McElfresh also discloses in at least

column 7, lines 8-13, the RAD server requests possible ads or content material from the ad content database based upon information about the particular user. The ad/content database then returns the possible ads for placement on the webpage that fit the particular characteristic of the user. Further more, McElfresh, in at least column 2, lines 56-62 discloses in context to an internet based system for presenting customized ads to users based on users' traits.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that McElfresh's system of using the RAD server for retrieving and presenting customized ads to consumers based on their characteristics and the context of presenting the customized (modified) offers over the Internet is equivalent in functionality to Applicant's invention using a retrieved engine to retrieve an offer and then using the presentation engine to modify (customize) the offer based on the offeree's trait and the context in which the offers are to be presented.

**Claim 2:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *a maintenance engine being adapted to cooperate with an administrator to create, modify, or delete an offer stored within the centralized repository;*

However, McElfresh in at least column 7, lines 1-8 and fig 3A discloses an interface that guides advertisers to create and upload advertisements into the ad/ content materials database. McElfresh also discloses content of the ads is created and /or licensed by administrators of such accounts and entered into the ad/content placement database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention McElfresh's system of using a web accessible interface to allow administrators to create, modify and upload the approved advertisements into ad/content placement database is equivalent in functionality to Applicant's invention using a maintenance engine in cooperation with an administrator to create, modify, or delete an offer stored within the centralized repository.

**Claims 9 and 10:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *maintenance engine being configured to facilitate tracking of times a particular offer has been sought or retrieved;*

- *maintenance engine being configured to facilitate tracking of times a particular class of offers has been sought or retrieved;*

However, McElfresh column 7, lines 33-60 and fig 3A with the associated text discloses a click through tracker that tracks and records click through into log file. The log file collects the number of click-through as well as the number of the ad impression from the RAD server. McElfresh also discloses in column 8, lines 15-29 and fig 3A with the associated text advertisers are able to monitor and track the performance of their ads from the ad /content performance database. Advertisers are provided with viewable data regarding the detailed statistics of their ads.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that McElfresh's system for monitoring and recording ads performance such as the number of times an ad is being retrieved through click-through is equivalent in functionality to Applicant's invention of tracking number of times of a particular offer or a class of offer has being retrieved by the maintenance engine.

**Claim 11:**

McElfresh disclose the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *maintenance engine being configured to facilitate export of a report in accordance with a predetermined set of criteria;*

However, McElfresh in at least column 7, lines 33-60 and fig 3A with the associated text discloses monitoring and recording of ads performance into a log file. The log file also collects the ads impression data from the RAD serve. The log file outputs the log data into log digester which interact with the Arbitator that runs periodically to differentiate users' and output processed data to the ad /content performance database. Furthermore, McElfresh in at least column 8, lines 15-28, discloses an interface that allows advertisers to access the ad/content performance database and view detailed statistical data about their ads performance.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that McElfresh's ability to periodically collecting ads impression and provide advertisers with viewable ads performance reports is equivalent in functionality to Applicant's invention of facilitate export of a report in accordance with a predetermined set of criteria by the maintenance engine.

**Claim 12:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh further discloses:

- *retrieval engine being configured to facilitate presenting of offers via a webpage (see at least column 7, lines 12-14);*

**Claims 13-19:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh further discloses:

- *a retrieval engine including a search tool for retrieving offers based on search criteria specified by a user;*

see at least column 2, lines 44-48, column 7, lines 8-14, column 9, lines 7-21 and fig 3A and fig 3B with the associated text.

**Claim 20:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh further discloses:

- *retrieval tool being configured to facilitate retrieval of an offer, said offer including only parameters defined by a user;*

McElfresh in at least column 2, lines 44-48 and fig 3A and fig 3B with the associated text discloses a user requests a page and a return of the webpage from a RAD server based on user request (input), and in at least column 9, lines 7-21 discloses receiving user's request for a page of information (defined parameters for a specific information) and returning the user's request with ads optimally arranged..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify McElfresh's system and method for optimum placement of advertisements on a webpage with offers based only on user parameter without considering user profile offers with the motivation of allowing users to search for gifts for third party.

**Claims 21 and 22:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *retrieval engine being configured to facilitate generation of a report describing offers contained within the repository;*
- *retrieval engine being configured to facilitate generation of a report describing times an offer has been retrieved;*



However, McElfresh in at least column 6, lines 57-67 and fig 3A with the associated text discloses a an ad/content placement database that contains information about each ad contract, and in column7, lines 33-60 and fig 3A with the associated text discloses monitoring and recording of ads performance into a log file. The log file also collects the ads impression data from the RAD serve. The log file outputs the log data into log digester which interact with the Arbitrator that runs periodically to differentiate users' and output processed data to the ad /content performance database. Furthermore, McElfresh in at least column 8, lines 15-28, discloses an interface that allows advertisers to access the ad/content performance database and view detailed statistical data about their ads performance.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that McElfresh's ability to retrieve and provide advertisers with viewable ads performance reports and contract includes information about each advertisement in the database is equivalent in functionality to Applicant's invention of retrieving a report describing offers stored within the repository and the number of times an offer is being retrieved using a retrieval engine.

**Claim 23:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh further discloses:

- *retrieval engine being configured to facilitate modification of an offer in accordance with a predetermined set of rules (see at least column 7, lines 8-14);*

**Claim 34:**

McElfresh discloses the limitations as shown above.

McElfresh further discloses:

- *wherein the centralized repository is further configured to store a set of offer details and the set of offer details include at least key word(s) (see at least column 6, lines 57-67 and fig 3A with the associated text);*

19. Claims 39-41 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElfresh et al, US Pat 6,907,566 B1 in view of Walker et al, US Pat 6,018,718.

**Claims 39 and 45:**

McElfresh disclose the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Walker, however discloses:

- *wherein the at least one offer element modified includes an interest rate* (see at least column 8, lines 61-67 and column 9, lines 1-35 and column 12, lines 56-57);
- *wherein the interest rate is adjusted based on at least the offeree's creditworthiness level* (see at least column 7, lines 51-60 and fig 4 with associated texts);
- *wherein the modified offer is a credit card offer* (see at least 3, lines 35-42);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate McElfresh's technique for presenting optimum advertisements on a webpage with Walker's method of customizing rewards based on specific account criteria with the motivation of capturing consumer's attention by providing consumers with offers that best fit their characteristics and need.

20. Claims 3, 4, 24-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElfresh et al, US Pat 6,907,566 B1 in view of Sullivan et al, US. Pub. No. 2001/0018665 A1.

**Claims 3 and 4:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, however Sullivan discloses:

- *provide a security mechanism to authenticate a merchant before granting access to the merchant;*
- *security mechanism being configured to limit access to a specific merchant or group of merchants whereby the security mechanism enables the maintenance engine to safeguard the confidentiality of data within the repository, preventing data from being disclosed in an unauthorized or undesirable manner* (see at least paragraphs 106 and 107);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique for presenting optimum advertisements on a webpage with Sullivan's technique of providing security mechanism of authentication to the system with the motivation to prevent malicious attack of the system.

**Claim 24:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not disclose, but Sullivan however, does disclose:

- *offer details includes at least an offer identifier, a description of qualifying offerees and an offer promotion identifier, an offer type, and a definition of offer terms* (see at least paragraph 3, and paragraph 19);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique of creating and storing advertisements information in a database and being able to retrieve the ads information based on users requests with Sullivan's method of identifying offers, identifying promotion offers description of qualifying offerees and so forth because as shown by Sullivan above identifications of offer and promotions and qualifications of services provider are all important entities of administrating promotions to effectively track promoted products and measure the effectiveness of the promotion.

**Claims 25, 27, 29, 30 and 36:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Sullivan however, discloses:

- *offer details includes at least a merchant name;*
- *said offer details includes at least merchant demographics;*
- *offer details includes at least a merchant type identifier;*
- *offer details includes at least a geographic location identifier; and*
- *offer details includes at least customer service telephone number.*

See at least paragraph 60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique of creating and storing advertisements information in a database and being able to retrieve the ads information based on users requests with Sullivan's offer details, because as shown by Sullivan above keeping track of retailers/clients helps manufacturers /services providers to better understand consumers needs.

**Claims 26 and 28:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Sullivan however, discloses:

- *offer details includes at least a trademark identifying the target merchant or the target goods;*
- *offer details includes at least an offer category identifier.*

See at least paragraph 78.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique of creating, storing and retrieving advertisements information based on users requests with Sullivan's terminology of offer details, because by administrating promotions, service providers know and learn which and what products are best to promote and keeping track of promoted products helps manufacturers /services to improve their services, manage and expand their marketing plans to better understand and target consumers in future.

**Claims 31, 32 and 33:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Sullivan however, discloses:

- *offer details includes at least a target product or service identifier ;*
- *offer details includes at least a description of a term of the offer ;*
- *offer details includes at least a definition of the term length for displaying the offer*

;

See at least paragraphs 13 and 108.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique of creating, storing and retrieving advertisements information based on users requests with Sullivan's terminology of offer details, because as shown above by Sullivan above keeping track of promoted products helps manufacturers/services to improve their services and meet consumers needs in a competent manner.

**Claim 35:**

McElfresh disclose the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Sullivan however, discloses:

- *offer details includes SKU/UPC information (see at least paragraph 14);*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine McElfresh's technique of creating and storing advertisements information in a database with Sullivan's terminology of offer details, because as shown by Sullivan above keeping track of promoted products helps manufacturers /services to improve their services and meet consumers needs in a competent manner.

**Claims 42 and 48:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose, but Walker however discloses:

- *wherein the context includes the availability of a product* (see at least column 5, lines 61-67 and column 6, lines 1-4);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the well known elements of McElfresh for the optimization of ads (offers) over the internet with the well known element of Walker's method and system of offering products based on the availability of the product and the context of the offer, since in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

22. Claims 5, 43-44 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McElfresh et al, US Pat 6,907,566 B1.

**Claim 5:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *wherein the system comprises one or more reviewing interfaces configured to allow reviewers to review and approve new offers;*

However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in advertising art that when creating and licensing advertisement there are numerous review and approval cycles.

For example, when manufacturer offers a promotion to a retail store. The manufacturer representative offers a promotion to a retailer buyer by providing the buyer the nature and terms of the promotion. The retailer buyers evaluates the proposed promotion and analyses it in terms of the retailer needs (business objectives of the promotion, timing of the promotion, financial impact of the promotion, etc). After evaluating the proposed promotion, the retailer accepts the promotion as is, or negotiates different terms or rejects the promotion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McElfresh's system for optimum placement of advertisements on the internet with reviewing interface that allows review and approval of new offers with the

motivation of ensuring the promotion is accurate, effective and conducted in compliance with the agreed terms.

**Claims 43-44 and 49-50:**

McElfresh discloses the limitation as shown above.

McElfresh does not specifically disclose:

- *wherein the offer element modified is the price of a product;*
- *wherein the price is modified based on the contextual environment criteria and wherein the contextual environment criteria includes the availability of the product;*

However, Official Notice is taken that it old and well known in marketing art, that a price of a product is modified based on the availability and the contextual environment of the product. For example, when a brand new Nintendo game is available for purchase, the price of the game stays high for a period of time until the company achieve their desired revenue and the product become widely available to consumers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McElfresh's system for optimum placement of advertisements on the Internet with modifying the price of a product based on the availability of the product and the contextual environment of the product with the motivation of maximizing the price of the product during the introductory period for recapturing developed cost.

***Conclusion***

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is files within TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX Months from the mailing date of this final.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Affaf Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-270-1835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am-6:00 pm est, alt Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached at 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.  
AA

/Yehdega Retta/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622